

Remarks:

Claims 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, Applicant has amended claims 26-30 and added new claims 31-33. No new matter has been added. Support for the amended language can be found in the specification and the drawings. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

§112 Rejection(s):

Claims 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because the phrase “a second device” was not defined either in the previously examined set of claims or in the specification as originally filed. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has removed references to “a second device” from claims 26-30, making the above ground of rejection moot.

The Examiner is reminded that §112, first paragraph, requires for the specification to adequately support the subject matter claimed rather than mirroring the claim language word for word. MPEP 2163, *Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116.

Support can be provided “in a variety of ways” and “using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas” to “show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). See, e.g., *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 68, 119 S. Ct. 304, 312, 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1647 (1998).

Further, claim limitations may be supported in the specification through “express, implicit, or inherent disclosure.” See *In re Oda*, 443 F.2d 1200, 170 USPQ 268 (CCPA 1971).

Contrary to the Examiner’s understanding, section §112, first paragraph does not require a word-for-word matching between the language in the specification and the language recited in the claims. If one were to interpret §112, first paragraph, according to the Examiner’s understanding, then the claim language would have to be limited to *identical* language used in the specification and nothing more.

Referring to MPEP 2163 (II) (A), “[t]he examiner has the initial burden, after a thorough reading and evaluation of the content of the application, of presenting evidence or reasons why a person skilled in the art would not recognize that the written description of the invention provides support for the claims. There is a strong presumption that an adequate written description of the claimed invention is present in the specification as filed. *Wertheim*, 541 F.2d at 262, 191 USPQ at 96.”

Respectfully, the Examiner has misinterpreted the requirements of §112 in rejecting the claims. Pursuant to MPEP §2163 (II) (A) and §2163.04, the Examiner is requested to present “evidence or reasoning to explain why persons skilled in the art would not recognize in the disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims,”¹ or otherwise withdraw the rejection.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 26-33 are in condition for allowance.

¹ MPEP § 2163.04 “If applicant ... points out where and/or how the originally filed disclosure supports the amendment(s), and the examiner finds that the disclosure does not reasonably convey that the inventor had possession of the subject matter of the amendment at the time of the filing of the application, the examiner has the initial burden of presenting evidence or reasoning to explain why persons skilled in the art would not recognize in the disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims.”).

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have expressly argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (310) 789-2100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/F. Jason Far-hadian/

Date: March 24, 2008

By: _____

F. Jason Far-hadian, Esq.

Registration No. 42,523